

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 14-19, and 21-23 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 11, 14, and 15 to further clarify the features set forth therein. In addition, Applicant cancels claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 without prejudice or disclaimer.

**I. Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 14-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

*Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lennon et al. (US 2002/0107973), hereinafter "Lennon" in view of alleged Applicant's admitted prior art (APA). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejections at least in view of the following exemplary comments.*

As a preliminary matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the APA section simply describes what is known to the Applicant at the time of the invention. That is, the APA may be internal knowledge of the application and not prior art with respect to the above-identified application. In other words, Applicant has not made any admissions as to the state of the art at the time of the invention.

Of these rejected claims, claims 1, 4, 11, 14, and 15 are independent. For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a search module for locating a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) using a unique identifier, wherein the unique identifier is pre-assigned to each program and is in a format of the received external digital content metadata and without further conversion into the metadata peculiar to the network, identifies said URL, said URL accessing a program in the

received external digital content metadata, wherein the digital content metadata received external to the network is TV-Anytime metadata, the digital content metadata peculiar to the network is Universal Plug and Play (UPnP) Content Directory service (CDS) metadata, and the unique identifier is a Content Reference Identifier (CRID).” Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the above-noted unique features of these claims.

Lennon describes dynamic generation of descriptions by the metadata server 212 and cannot be said to be unique identifiers that is pre-assigned to each program and is in a format of the received external digital content metadata and without further conversion into the metadata peculiar to the network, identifies said URL. The APA does not cure this deficiency because each device interprets metadata peculiar to the network and not external to the network. That is, the APA only describes TV-Anytime devices interpreting TV-Anytime format (not metadata in a format external to the network).

Also, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the references. Since TV-Anytime described in the APA is in an XML format, combining the APA with Lennon would result in XML metadata. That is, there is no reason to combine the references as they would not produce format external to the network, as alleged by the Examiner.

In addition, it is clear that the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest that the digital content metadata received external to the network is TV-Anytime metadata, the digital content metadata peculiar to the network is Universal Plug and Play (UPnP) Content Directory service (CDS) metadata, and the unique identifier is a Content Reference Identifier (CRID). The Examiner fails to substantiate this rejection with respect to these features with actual teachings in the prior art. Instead, the Examiner alleges that it would be obvious to convert between the two

standards since these standards are popular so as to accommodate more users (*see* page 4 of the Office Action).

The Examiner's position amounts to a mere speculation disregarding the technical skill and expertise that is required for such conversions. Applicant respectfully submits that if it is obvious to convert between these two standards, it should not be difficult for the Examiner to substantiate this position with an actual reference. Since lack of references already demonstrates the weakness of the Examiner's position, it is clear that these claims are patentable for at least these exemplary reasons. As discussed during the initial Interview of March 2, 2010, claim 2 contains allowable subject matter since the Examiner could not find any new references in the updated search.

In addition, dependent claim 23 recites: "the unique identifier located in the received external digital content metadata binds information of the received external digital content metadata, wherein the mapping module uses the information bound by the unique identifier for converting received external digital content metadata into digital content metadata peculiar to a network, and wherein additional unconverted metadata from the received external digital content metadata is placed in a <desc> section, which is a section for metadata that is not defined in a class of the digital content metadata peculiar to the network."

The Examiner fails to address how the prior art discloses using the information bound by the unique identifier for the conversion. Applicant respectfully submits that Lennon in view of the APA does not and cannot describe these features of claim 23. The CRID (alleged unique identifier) of the APA is not used for any conversions but only used as the TV-Anytime metadata.

Also, instead of relying on the actual disclosure of the prior art to show the <desc> section, the Examiner simply alleges that logically grouping similar data is known (*see* page 6 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Not only is the Examiner's position not rooted in the prior art of record but it also impermissibly generalizes and paraphrases the actual features of claim

23. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record clearly does not disclose or suggest creating a new structure for a metadata in a format peculiar to the network that will have a special section for unconverted data i.e., for data in a format unreadable by the device (external content).

For at least these additional exemplary reasons, claim 23 is patentable over Lennon in view of the APA.

*Claims 5 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lennon and Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA), and further in view of Sie et al. (US 2002/0199188), hereinafter "Sie". Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejections at least in view of the following exemplary comments.*

Applicant submits that the Sie, alone or in combination, fails to cure the above deficiencies of Lennon in view of the APA, and accordingly, the claims are patentable over the references for at least this reason.

### III. Conclusion

Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



~~Nataliya Dvorson~~  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 16, 2010